

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/942,830	08/30/2001	Johannes Wilhelmus Maria Sonnemans	ACH2823US	9198	
7:	590 02/13/2003				
Louis A. Mor	ris		EXAM	EXAMINER	
Akzo Nobel Inc. 7 Livingstone Avenue			NGUYEN, TAM M	, TAM M	
Dobbs Ferry, N	IY 10522		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1764	C	
			DATE MAILED: 02/13/2003	ح	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

\$ - 1		AS-6,				
	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
•	09/942,830	SONNEMANS ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Tam M. Nguyen	1764				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address						
Period for Reply  A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICA  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 3 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communi  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) d  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statute  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply with any reply received by the Office later than three months after earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).  Status	ATION.  37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a cation.  lays, a reply within the statutory minimum of the ory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MO.  by statute, cause the application to become A	reply be timely filed introduced timely.  INTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  INTHS (Structure) (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed	on <u>30 August 2001</u> .					
, ,	)⊠ This action is non-final.					
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.  Disposition of Claims						
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-28</u> is/are pending in the app	plication.					
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are	withdrawn from consideration.					
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-28</u> is/are rejected.						
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.						
Application Papers						
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.						
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) □ accepted or b) □ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any object						
11) The proposed drawing correction filed o		disapproved by the Examiner.				
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.						
12) The oath or declaration is objected to by	y trie Examiner.					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120		\$ 440(a) (d) as (f)				
13)⊠ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).						
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☒ None of:						
<u> </u>	1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.					
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No						
<ul> <li>3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).</li> <li>* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.</li> </ul>						
14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).						
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign langu	· ·					
Attachment(s)						
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Pape	0-948) 5)	v Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)  f Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) .				

Art Unit: 1764

## DETAILED ACTION

## **Double Patenting**

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-22 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 16 and 17 of copending Application No. 09/829,624. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the process presently claimed process uses a catalyst which is the same as the catalyst use in of the claimed process of copending application. The claimed process of copending application does not disclose the characteristics of the feedstock and an amount of the sulfur content in the product stream. However, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the process of claims 1, 16 and 16 by using the presently claimed feedstock because one of skill in the art would utilize any hydrocarbon feedstock including the claimed feedstock and because of the similarities between the present claimed process and the copending claimed process in terms of catalyst and operating conditions, it would be expected that the product stream of the

Art Unit: 1764

copending claimed process would contain the amount of sulfur as claimed in the present claimed process.

This is a <u>provisional</u> obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Claims 1-22 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 17 and 18 of copending Application No. 09/829,640. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the process presently claimed process uses a catalyst which is the same as the catalyst use in of the claimed process of copending application. The claimed process of copending application does not disclose the characteristics of the feedstock and an amount of the sulfur content in the product stream. However, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the process of claims 1, 17 and 18 by using the present claimed feedstock because one of skill in the art would utilize any hydrocarbon feedstock including the claimed feedstock and because of the similarities between the present claimed process and the copending claimed process in terms of catalyst and operating conditions, it would be expected that the product stream of the copending claimed process would contain the amount of sulfur as claimed in the present claimed process.

This is a <u>provisional</u> obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Claims 1-22 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 32 and 33 of copending Application No. 09/829,625. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not

patentably distinct from each other because the process presently claimed process uses a catalyst which is the same as the catalyst use in of the claimed process of copending application. The claimed process of copending application does not disclose the characteristics of the feedstock and an amount of the sulfur content in the product stream. However, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the process of claims 1, 32 and 33 by using the present claimed feedstock because one of skill in the art would utilize any hydrocarbon feedstock including the claimed feedstock and because of the similarities between the present claimed process and the copending claimed process in terms of catalyst and operating conditions, it would be expected that the product stream of the copending claimed process.

This is a <u>provisional</u> obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 1 is indefinite because it is unclear what happens when the hydrocarbon feedstock is contacted with the catalyst.

Claim 2 recites the limitation "the product" in line 1. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Art Unit: 1764

Claim 12 is indefinite because it is unclear what happens when the hydrocarbon feedstock is contacted with the catalyst.

Claim 13 recites the limitation "the product" in line 1. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gerritsen et al. (EP-0870817 A1) in view of either Takahashi et al. (4,845,068), Takahashi (EP-0357295 A2), or Takahashi (EP-289211 A1).

Gerritsen discloses a hydrodesulfurization process by contacting a hydrocarbon feedstock with a catalyst in one or two reaction zones. The Gerritsen feedstock is the same as the claimed feedstock and the reactions zones are operated at conditions similar to the claimed operating conditions. (See page 4, lines 2-42)

Gerritsen does not disclose that the catalyst comprises sulfur-containing organic additive. However, Takahashi (all three references) disclose a hydrodesulfurization process wherein the process is employed a catalyst comprising metals of group VIB, VIII, and mercaptocarboxylic acids (See abstracts of all three references). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the process of

Art Unit: 1764

Gerritsen by using the catalyst of Takahashi because the catalyst of Takahashi is effective in a

hydrodesulfurization process. It is noted that all the references do not disclose the amount of

sulfur in the product stream. However, the similarities of the modified process of Gerritsen and

the claimed process in terms of catalyst, feedstock, and operation conditions. Therefore, it would

be expected that the product stream would contain the amount of sulfur as claimed.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Tam M. Nguyen whose telephone number is (703) 305-7715.

The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Glenn Caldarola can be reached on 703-308-6824. The fax phone numbers for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 305-5408 for regular

communications and (703) 305-9311 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding

should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0661.

Tam M. Nguyen

Page 6

Examiner

Art Unit 1764

Tam Nguyen/TN February 8, 2003

'Gienn Caldarola

Sup rvisory Patent Examiner

Technology Center 1700